



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,474	06/20/2001	Philip Goatly	82045- 272204	3884

27500 7590 02/24/2005

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
ATTENTION: DOCKETING DEPARTMENT
11682 EL CAMINO REAL, SUITE 200
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130

EXAMINER

PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/885,474

Applicant(s)

GOATLY ET AL.

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3, 11-16 and 26-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-10, 17-25 and 32-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-44 are presented for examination.

Priority

2. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged.

Election/Restrictions

3. Applicant's election without traverse of Invention II, claims 4-10, 17-25, 32-44 in the reply filed on 10/22/2004 is acknowledged.
4. Examiner examines the applicant elected Invention II, i.e., claims 4-10, 17-25, 32-44.
5. Applicant is requested to cancel non-elected Invention I claims 1-3, 11-16, 26-31.

Specification

6. Unless the invention is created from scratch, applicant should provide all the prior arts that have led to the invention, i.e., existing patents and publications related to the claimed subject matter. In response, applicant is requested to provide the title, citation and copy of each publication related to the claimed subject matter (See 37 CFR 1.56).

Appropriate correction is required.

7. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it does not contain claimed limitations, for example, limitations of independent claim 4. Also the abstract does not clearly state the goal of the invention. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

8. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The present title is not sufficient for proper classification of the claimed subject matter. Following title is suggested: "Modeling business documents using business document model containing Uniform Modeling Language and hierarchical structure elements".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 4-10, 17-25, 32-44, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah, U.S. Publication, 2003/0058277, Mar 27, 2003, "A view configurer in a presentation services patterns environment", Accenture (Hereinafter Bowman-Amuah-Accenture) in view of Greef et. al. IBM, 6,397,221 (Hereafter Greef-IBM).

11. As per claims 4, 7, 17, 22, 32, 37, 41, Bowman-Amuah-Accenture clearly teaches an apparatus (e.g., abstract, figures 1-5, 51), a computer readable medium (e.g., figure 1) and a method (e.g., abstract) comprising:

an object modeler (e.g., figures 45-52, paragraphs 2656 – 2662, page 95),

a model extractor coupled to the object modeler (e.g., figures 49-52, 56, paragraphs 2620 – 2634, page 94) that extracts a document model from the object modeler into an object database

Art Unit: 2154

(e.g., figures 49-52, 56, paragraphs 2620 - 2634, page 94) as a hierarchy table (e.g., figures 41, 42, 52, paragraphs 2311 –2314, page 80, paragraphs 230-235, page 8),

modeling business documents (e.g., figures 49-52, 56, paragraphs 2620 – 2634, page 94 in a modeling language as a business document model (e.g., paragraphs 2250-2257, page 76),

a report generator to generate reports from the hierarchy table (e.g., figures 29 – 32),

categorizing business objects in a business model (e.g., figures 37 – 49),

representing variations of common business objects in the business model (e.g., figures 37 – 49),

defining data classes and attributes of business objects with in the business model (e.g., figure 50, paragraphs 228 – 235, page 8),

receiving objects (e.g., figures 15, 29) represented by elements (e.g., paragraphs 714, 715, page 24) with configuration attributes (e.g., figure 50, paragraph 2922 page 105 – paragraph 2938, page 106) and semantics corresponding to the elements (e.g., paragraph 4363, page 172, paragraph 3030, page 110, paragraph 2939, page 106, paragraph 245, page 9), the elements having a hierarchical structure (e.g., paragraphs 714, 715, page 24),

displaying the hierarchical structure of the hierarchical structure elements (e.g., figures 50, 51, 56, 57, 75, 76); displaying the objects depicted as configured by the configuration attributes (e.g., figures 50, 51, 56, 57, 75, 76; and displaying the semantics (e.g., figures 50, 51, 56, 57, 75, 76).

However, Bowman-Amuah-Accenture does not specifically mention about hierarchical structure definition and generating a hierarchical structure definition.

Greef-IBM teaches hierarchical structure definition (e.g., col. 27, lines 5 – 45, abstract) and generating a hierarchical structure definition (e.g., col. 27, lines 5 – 45, abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bowman-Amuah-Accenture with the teachings of Greef-IBM in order to facilitate generating hierarchical structure definition because hierarchical structure definition would help manage information. The motivation would be obvious because Greef-IBM teachings of creating hierarchical structure definition would help handle/manipulate data in the database. The hierarchical structure definition would help access information for the database.

12. As per claim 5, Bowman-Amuah-Accenture teaches the following:

a document analyzer (e.g., paragraph 262, figure 49) allows the creation of a hierarchical document (e.g., page 105, paragraphs 2913, 2926-2929; page 95, paragraphs 2654-2666).

13. As per claim 6, Bowman-Amuah-Accenture teaches the following:

a validator (e.g., figure 49, page 150, paragraph 3852) that validates the compliance of the hierarchical document with the report information (e.g., page 150, paragraph 3852 – paragraph 3891, page 152).

14. As per claims 8, 23, Bowman-Amuah-Accenture teaches the following:

the modeling language is Uniform Modeling Language (e.g., paragraphs 2250-2257, page 76).

15. As per claims 9, 18, 24, 33, Bowman-Amuah-Accenture teaches the following:
the hierarchical structure definition is an extensible Markup Language Document Type Definition comprising Document Type Definition elements (e.g., paragraphs 714, 715, page 24).

16. As per claims 10, 19, 25, 34, Bowman-Amuah-Accenture teaches the following:
the hierarchical structure definition is an extensible Markup Language schema (e.g., paragraphs 714, 715, page 24, paragraphs 2629 –2630, page 94).

17. As per claims 20, 35, Bowman-Amuah-Accenture teaches the following:
coupling configuration attributes with the Document Type Definition Elements as Document Type Definition attributes (e.g., figure 50, paragraph 2922 page 105 – paragraph 2938, page 106).

18. As per claims 21, 36, Bowman-Amuah-Accenture teaches the following:
displaying the hierarchical structure definition based on the coupled configuration attributes (e.g., figure 50, paragraph 2922 page 105 – paragraph 2938, page 106).

19. As per claims 38, 42, Bowman-Amuah-Accenture teaches the following:
allowing the addition or editing of mapping information corresponding to the objects (e.g., paragraphs 644– 646, page 21).

Art Unit: 2154

20. As per claims 39, 43, Bowman-Amuah-Accenture teaches the following:

the hierarchical structure definition is an extensible Markup Language Document Type Definition (e.g., paragraphs 714, 715, page 24) and the hierarchical structure definition elements are Document Type Definition elements (e.g., paragraphs 714, 715, page 24).

21. As per claims 40, 44, Bowman-Amuah-Accenture teaches the following:

the hierarchical structure definition is an extensible Markup Language schema (e.g., paragraphs 714, 715, page 24, paragraphs 2629 –2630, page 94) and the hierarchical structure definition elements are extensible Markup Language elements (e.g., paragraphs 714, 715, page 24).

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

February 10, 2005


SUSAN M. DISBEE
SUPERVISOR EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100